



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
08/467,397	06/06/95	FRANK	RYZ-041

18N2/1219

LAPPIN & KUSMER
200 STATE STREET
BOSTON MA 02109

EXAMINER	
WEISS, B	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1805	12

DATE MAILED: 12/19/96

Please find below a communication from the EXAMINER in charge of this application.

Commissioner of Patents

see attached

Interview Summary

Application No.

08/467,397

Applicant(s)

Frank et al.

Examiner

Bonnie Weiss

Group Art Unit

1805



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Bonnie Weiss

(3) _____

(2) Wayne Cowen

(4) _____

Date of Interview Dec 16, 1996Type: ☒ Telephonic ☐ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☐ applicant's representative).Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☒ No. If yes, brief description:Agreement ☒ was reached. ☐ was not reached.Claim(s) discussed: pending

Identification of prior art discussed:

Offensberger

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Applicants offered to limit claim 1 to oligos that bind to a region of secondary structure in the epsilon region of the HBV genome (see Figures 1 and 3). In light of the arguments submitted in Paper No. 10 regarding the unpredictability of oligos that overlap or encompass other oligos known to inhibit expression when mRNA secondary structures are present, Mr. Cowen was told that the office would favorably consider such an amendment and withdraw obviousness rejections based on Offensberger. In addition, the examiner has agreed to withdraw art rejections based on the use of such oligos as hybridization probes so long as applicants limit claim 1 to those oligos which bind to the region of secondary structure.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1. ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2. ☐ Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

Examiner Note: You must sign and stamp this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.